Temperance-1932

TOLEDO, O.
TIMES

MAY 4 1932

Letters to the Editor

BELLS OF FREEDOM

To the Editor:

I am too young and immature to set forth a formal solution of the alcohol problem. That prohibition is a menace to the prosperity and liberty of this country's people is an established fact. I am old enough to understand this.

"Give us back light wines and beer," is the cry. It is the slave's cry. And we, all of us who live under the constitution that expounds the loveliness of a ringing freedom, are the slaves. Were the Negroes freed gradually? Freed for one hour a week, one day a week, one week a month, one month a year and so on? I understand that they were slaves one day and freemen the next. Would it have been better had they been freed gradually? Some of them lost their heads at first. One expected that. But they adjusted themselves to their freedom in a short time. And then I understand that one day an American citizen could take a drink at the corner saloon and still be law-abiding. The next day the saloon was closed, and a sign on the door read, "There! Make the best of it." It is much harder to adjust oneself to slavery than to freedom.

Then why start with light wines and beer? Why tease? Why not give to those who wish it the right to drink what they please? Of course there will be those who will make fools of themselves. Let them. Is it any worse for a man to make a fool of himself than for the government to make a fool of him by telling him that he hasn't sense enough to know when he has drunk enough? Would it not be much easier, as well as much less expensive, to teach the man how to drink sensibly, than to try to keep him from drinking at all?

And wouldn't it sound rather sweet to hear the bells of freedom ringing again? C. H. M.

Toledo, O.

CHARLOTTE, N. C
OBSERVER

JUN 4 1932

Selling the Mule.

(From The Laurinburg Exchange.)

From Decatur, Georgia, comes the news that a mule is to be sold there under authority of the State prohibition law, perhaps for the first time in history. Automobiles have been confiscated and sold time and again, but not mules. The story is that a negro drove the mule to town hitched to a buggy. The police called to him to stop. The negro didn't stop but he left the mule and buggy behind. Search revealed a quantity of whiskey in the buggy. Then a farmer came to town and claimed the buggy. He got it. Nobody claimed the mule and it is to be sold and will make prohibition history.

Italian Official Would Have Wine Replace Afternoon Tea

New York Times

Special Correspondence, THE NEW YORK TIMES

ROME, July 12.—The proposal to replace afternoon tea with afternoon wine as one of the normal social functions of modern society was made by Arturo Marescalchi, Under-Secretary of State for Agriculture and Forests, at a congress of wine-growers held recently in Turin. What could be more appropriate, he asked, than to do away with the exotic habit of drinking tea in favor of drinking such a typically Italian product as wine?

It was stated that the production of wine is the greatest Italian industry, with an investment of 32,000,000,000 lire. About 4,000,000 Italians derive their livelihood directly or indirectly from the production and sale of wines. To increase the consumption of wine is, therefore, a highly desirable object at the present moment, in which Italian agriculture is so sorely in need of relief.

PROHIBITION

New York Herald Tribune
7/26/32

PROHIBITION— Has it failed? Emphatically NO! When launched it was not expected that it would bear as much fruit in one day as in fifty years. Rum and "John Barleycorn", twin friends with all evil have run rampant for endless ages. No reformation wielded by human agency could check it in a few short years; if so, the same time the reformation was begun it would die. The success of prohibition cannot be attributed to the effort of any one political party, but to the group of good men and Godly women regardless to their party affiliation. Its seeming failure in the short time it has been under way should not be taken as impracticable and as a reason for its discontinuance, especially when those responsible for its success like guts to enforce the regulations governing it. A grain of corn is planted, it comes up, but failed to be worked, the vegetation choked it down, it grows slowly, producs little, but for the reason of its slow growth and small production is due to improper or inopportune planting and lack of care; hence prohibition's seeming slow progress is due to lack of support—enforcement.

PROHIBITION: What it stands for and what does it do?

Specifically, the forbidding by-law, the sale of alcholic liquors as beverages. It stands for the sanctity of the home, moral purity and a thousand other things that spell RIGHT living.

WHAT HAS IT DONE?

Its achievements have been less than marvelous.

IS IT RIGHT TO LEGALIZE AN EVIL?

Is it right to condone crime? The Ten Commandments the prohibitory measure: "Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." These and all the other commandments are trampled upon when liquor is in control. When whiskey is in, wit is out, a man will do most anything dirty, mean and unbecoming. Everyone must admit we have better homes today, than we had when whiskey was legalized. To sell it when legalized does not make it right morally. If it is wrong to handle it without license then it is wrong with "REVENUE" lost. Which is worse to lose character, home, government or revenue?—Morals or revenue—which? President Hoover will on the eleventh of August let the country know where he stands on prohibition. What will he say? Guess, if you can. Not only what the President says, what do you say, Mr. Voter? I'll guess.

THE A. M. E. CHURCH STANDS FOR PROHIBITION

The A. M. E. Church, for more than a hundred years, has stood for temperance, purity, morality, right living in every way for Christianity, for the Fatherhood of God, the universal brotherhood of man. No backing bells will she ring now, revenue or no revenue. The Bishops, many of whom are sainted, with the fifteen present ones, are spiritual fathers, not politicians, but statesmen of the highest type, directors in all matters relative to civic righteousness, moral purity and equality in the courts.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.
STAR

SEP 15 1932

HAS NO USE FOR LIQUOR.

To the Editor of The Star:

After reading a brief account of the Quakers in Friday's Star, I am "moved by the spirit" to say that the Quakers who obeyed the "higher law" rather than the fugitive slave law did so to aid the "forgotten man," the Negro slave, so he could have "personal liberty." Those Quakers will have "stars in their crowns" even if they did have fewer crowns in their pocketbooks after paying their fines.

Their names will be written with those who love their fellowmen and not with those of the purveyors of booze to drunken slaves. No doubt many of their descendants are now trying to liberate the slaves of drink and will help take John Barleycorn "for a ride" in November.

We want to free the slaves of drink and make America safe for humanity. The booze seller loves tainted money better than his neighbor. The Quaker loved his black brother better than his own honest ney. There's a difference.

WALTER N. VANSCOYOC.
wfordsville, Ind.

LIQUOR REGULATION

The change of opinion about the prohibition amendment is little short of revolutionary. What few challenged four years ago, and no party dared to take up has lost its untouchableness. Both parties deal with it in their platforms this year and the once sacred cow is laughed at in public.

If after election the winning party resubmits or repeals the eighteenth amendment, our country will have "swapped the devil for the witch" because no negative legislation offers a working policy. Negroes in their citizen rights are an example of how little is done toward directing public and individual conduct when the Constitution says "Thou shalt not." We would not be banned and damned if the language of the Civil war amendments had directed what was to be done instead of stopping with saying only what was not to be done.

Positive order is always better than any negative commandment. The one is sure of itself and gets respect. The other avoids the issue and leaves it to the individual to find his own action. He usually does nothing. In the case of the Negro the refusa of congress to support the fourteenth and

South Always Liked Liquor

Why the South is Dry. Forgot states' rights and became dry to save its young men and because of presence of the Negro—Superficial conversion now yields to political expediency.

By KELLY MILLER

The traditional South was wet. The old fashioned, manorial Southern gentleman without his toddy was a contradiction of terms. Southern hospitality connotes the overflowing of the bowl. Any suggestion looking to the control of his conduct was deemed an affront to his dignity and personal liberty. The Democratic platform, until the rise of Bryan, then under the domination of the Southern Bourbons, usually carried a provision against sumptuary laws. There was lacking the Puritan background which, in the North, made total abstinence a religious requirement.

Kelly Miller

But in late years the South has become converted to the gospel of prohibition, and with the customary zeal of the new convert, does now outrun the other disciples. Why did the South surrender its immemorial doctrine of states' rights and yield to federal control of the intimate conduct of the people? As every cause has a consequence, so every effect must have a cause.

Presence of the Negro

How, then, shall we account for it? The chief reason was due to the presence of the the Negro. Free flowing liquor always spells destruction to a backward race, as to the retarded section of the advanced race. It was felt that intoxicating liquor made the Negro unsteady and unreliable as a domestic servant and productive worker, and also made him a disturber of the public peace and dangerous to the security of the white race.

Any people unaccustomed to discipline and self-control is apt to become the ready victim of alcoholic drink. Statesmanship always suggests keeping such stimulants out of their reach. The prohibition doctrine originated in the North. One of its strong incentives was to keep intoxicating drink out of the reach of the Irish immigrant who then recruited the lower stratum of society.

Henry Ford and other great industrialists advocate prohibition on the ground that modern industry demands a sober working man. The Pennsylvania Railroad tests the breath of its engineers on each trip, not out of a sense of virtue, but of safety and efficiency in service. In this regard, the South was following an ordinary line of prudent procedure.

Danger to Whites

Free flowing liquor was proving itself dangerous to the young of the white race in the South. Strong drink throws off the inhibitions of civilization and throws the inebriant back on a lower level of primitivity where the more primitive instincts find easy range and rampage. The lower and baser instincts of both races are thus stimulated, bringing them down to a fraternity of vice and vulgarity. Here in Washington, it was noticeable a decade or so ago, how frequently the sons of distinguished Southern statesmen fell prey to the alcoholic demon.

In 1924

When the common white man began to function in the Southern states he instituted option and the dispensary system, a hasty experiment under Tillman of South Carolina. About this time, along came William Jennings Bryan, the political evangelist, and dried up the Democratic party to keep it from being buried in a liquid grave.

The dry Democratic South and the wet Democratic North met at Madison Square Garden in 1924 William G. McAdoo and Al Smith were the champions of their respective sections. A neutral was chosen. In 1928, the dry South got the platform and the wet North the candidate. In that campaign the Democratic candidate for President was wet while the Vice-President was dry; just as in the present campaign, the Republican Vice-President is tetotally dry, while the President is dry-wet or wet-dry.

At Chicago

At the Chicago convention we were amazed at the ease with which the Southern states shifted ground. William G. McAdoo, the erstwhile dry champion, suddenly endorsed the doctrine of repeal, and carried the better, that is the bigger part of the South with him. State after state which four years ago, on the pretext of wetness, had crucified Al Smith on a Catholic Cross, voted solidly wet when the testing roll was called. Such a sudden reversal of sentiment would be unbelievable had I not heard it with my ears over the radio and read it with my eyes in the press next morning.

Superficial

The South's conversion to prohibition which reverses its whole theory of state rights and local sovereignty, was but superficial, and not soul-deep. It did not reach to the tap-root of moral conviction, as in the North. It yielded readily to a political expediency. Indeed both parties are now playing football with a moral issue, each manipulating for the ball in order to make a touchdown.

The Democratic South is ostensibly dry, while the Democratic North is hopelessly wet.

The Republican North has turned wet, while the Western contingent remains dry.

The cities are wet; the country is dry.

The Democratic city population is rapidly outstripping the rural Republican counterpart.

Unless the Grand Old Party bestirs itself, it will soon find itself outnumbered by urban wetness. Under exactions of this situation, both North and South, Democrats and Republicans, are compromising on this moral issue at incalculable cost to the conscience. For the politician, North or South, Democratic or Republican, loves victory more than virtue.

PUNCTURING PROHIBITION.

Responsibility for increase in crime and decrease in respect for law and practically total failure to achieve hoped-for results is attributed to the present prohibition laws by the committee on criminality of the American Bar Association in a report submitted Wednesday to the annual convention of the association in Washington.

Emphasizing the growth of the criminal classes of the country, the report takes the position that "prohibition brought about a condition of times and customs and law which made it easy for the gangster to obtain a large personal organization at a small risk, and that it also brought about a demand for the services of outlaws such as we never had in this or any other country prior to prohibition."

Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spent by the government in the efforts to enforce the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead law, the committee feels that there now exists "a general and widespread demand on the part of a large section of the American public for intoxicating liquor," with few people, "if any," considering violation of the dry laws as involving moral turpitude.

The result, the committee holds, is that "not only do a great section of the American public look with approval upon the violation of the law itself, but those engaged in its violation are considered respectable citizens whose services are more or less essential to the comfort and well-being of the community."

With such a public attitude towards the prohibition laws it is inevitable that respect for all other laws should decrease and that organized crime, fattened by the huge profits from the illicit liquor trade, is enabled to spread its tentacles into every circle of society, and corrupt both office holders and police officials to an extent never before known.

Citing the extent to which the power of law enforcement agencies has been broken down, the committee reports that "because of the huge profits connected with organized bootlegging sales, the profits of prostitution and gambling, gangs flourish in every large city in the United States, with few exceptions."

No such picture of the collapse of attempts to enforce a law, of the encouragement of crime of all kinds and of the weakening of the moral fiber of the people has ever before been painted in the United States.

That it is an accurate description of actual conditions is evident to every man and woman familiar with the liquor situation throughout the country. Certainly no other body of citizens is more competent to pass unbiased judgment upon the results of the "noble experiment" than the lawyers of the country who, day in and day out, are called upon either to assist in prosecuting, or to defend, those charged with its violation.

The report of the committee will go far towards accelerating the steadily growing tide of popular resentment against the present prohibition laws and is certain to bring nearer the time when they will be substituted by some plan of liquor control more capable of enforcement and with greater promise of bringing about the increased temperance which is the desire of every good citizen.

Temperance - 1932

THE SOUTH AND REPEAL.

Analysis of the vote in the house on the Garner resolution for prohibition repeal, strikingly illustrates the extent to which sentiment with regard to the eighteenth amendment has changed in the south.

For many years the states in this section were the backbone of the movement for a prohibition clause in the federal constitution. As a bloc they were the first to ratify the amendment and until the elections of this year were generally considered the chief stumbling block to repeal.

Monday's vote in the house, following the action during the year of several southern states in naming repeal candidates in elections held, reveals that the south, just as it was the first to realize the necessity for greater control of the liquor traffic, has been equally prompt to recognize that the inefficiency, and impossibility, of enforcement of the present laws has been convincingly demonstrated.

The Florida, North Carolina and Virginia delegations in the house voted solidly for repeal, while Texas voted 13 for, to 2 against, and Alabama divided, 8 to 2. The vote of other southern delegations further emphasizes the significant change that has taken place in this section of the country.

Unquestionably there has been no change in the deep-rooted opposition of the people of the south to the liquor traffic. They are as sincerely devoted as ever to the principle of national temperance. They have merely awakened to the fact that the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead act have not only resulted in the country being flooded with poisonous concoctions of all kinds but that they have brought about a condition of lawlessness defiance never before known.

Early in the summer the voters of North Carolina, in a straight-out repeal contest, retired a distinguished representative in the United States senate in order that his seat might be filled by a man whose prohibition views are more in keeping with present sentiment.

An outstanding woman prohibitionist, a member of congress from Florida, soon after met defeat in a primary in which repeal was also the dominant issue. The result of state-wide elections in both Texas and Louisiana conclusively demonstrate the attitude of these other two southern states toward the eighteenth amendment.

The defeat of the Garner resolution by the vote of members who have been repudiated at the polls and whose successors favor repeal is an inexcusable instance of open defiance of the plainly registered will of the people, and illustrates the danger of the so-called "lame duck" sessions of congress.

The democrats who voted "no" on this resolution flouted their party platform and wilfully ignored the mandate of the people—all to no purpose for the passage of repeal legislation is inevitable with the convening of the new congress.

The net result of the defeat of the Garner resolution is merely a postponement of the time when the people will have an opportunity to pass upon the question of repeal, but the vote is at least gratifying in showing that the south, still firmly wedded to the principle of national temperance, is unwilling to countenance a continuation of present condition.

ONTARIO, CAL.
REPORT
OCT 26 1932

NEGRO RAPS PLAN TO RETURN BOOZE

Theodore R. Howard, negro winner of the national oratorical contest on prohibition, answered his subject-question, "Will America Go Back After Twelve Years of Prohibition," with an emphatic "No" last night when he addressed a crowd of 150 at the Upland Presbyterian church.

Howard traced the action leading up to the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, stating that it was adopted in congress by men who had been elected before the army men left for Europe. It was not "put over" on the nation, he declared.

Prohibition will be retained, Howard predicted, but added that dry forces had made a mistake in dropping their educational campaigns after the passage of the national prohibition act.

THE CHURCH AND THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Representative Artemus K. Callahan, of Tuscaloosa County, is a young man but he is learning early that a politician must take life more or less as it comes, especially if one is the sort of politician who prefers to consult his own conscience before voting.

Mr. Callahan seems to be that sort of politician. It occurred to him that there was no good reason why a non-intoxicating beverage like Bevo should not be sold in Alabama, and accordingly he voted for Bevo.

It occurred to him also that there was no good reason why Sunday amusements could not be allowed in Birmingham, Mobile and Montgomery if the people of those communities desired them.

That the people of Montgomery and Mobile desired Sunday amusements is demonstrated by the fact that they have had Sunday amusements for many years.

There being some question as to the legal status of such amusements in Montgomery and Mobile, and since Birmingham had indicated to his satisfaction that it desired similar amusements on Sunday, Mr. Goodwyn, of Montgomery, introduced his bill to meet the demands of the situation.

Mr. Callahan's conscience was not affronted by the Goodwyn bill, so he voted for it.

But Mr. Callahan's brethren of the Holt Baptist Church in Tuscaloosa county decided that their consciences had been affronted and they thereupon forced his resignation as secretary and member of the board of deacons, following a sulphurous sermon by the Rev. H. H. Buzbee, the Jonathan Edwards of the Warrior Basin.

When Mr. Callahan joined the Baptist church we dare say he was not asked how he stood on the near beer question.

We doubt also if he was asked how he stood on the question of legalizing Sunday amusements in communities that desired them.

He made his profession of faith, not in the Anti-Saloon League, not in the Lord's Day Alliance, not even in the Rev. Mr. Buzbee, but in Jesus Christ "and Him crucified."

He was not advised that his brethren of the church would assume responsibility for his private political conscience.

He was not advised that so long as he deported himself becomingly he would be punished if as a citizen and public official he voted on a question of public policy in accordance with his private convictions.

He was not advised that his brethren would demand the right to dictate to him on pain of public humiliation.

The rules were switched on Mr. Callahan after he joined the church.

It is his own affair, but it occurs to The Advertiser that it would not be inappropriate for Representative Callahan to meet this affront to his dignity as a man and as a public official by transferring his allegiance to some other congregation.

Finally it remains to be said that it is deplorable that an intellectual scandal of this kind could occur in a county which contains Alabama's great seat of learning.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.
PRESS
NOV 23 1932

The South Goes Wet

What of the South and prohibition? In simple truth, the South intended prohibition for the Negro only. Then it became a religious dogma. And, as church membership and attendance are cachets of value, socially and in business, in the South, when the pulpit decided to add the control of customs and manners to its supervision of things spiritual and things moral, that settled temporarily the fate of intoxicating beverages.

The rural sections are satisfied with prohibition, as it affects them little. Many bootleggers find their best corn liquor on farms. But the South is fed up on political pulpiteers. The frenetic stage of bone-dry emotionalism is as dead as the ashes of yesterday. The trend here is definitely against prohibition, and the South would like to take its liquor and its religion straight once more.— Julan Harris in Current History.